

THE STATE WINS.

Judge Hugus Upholds Demurrer to Pleas in Abatement.

AN ELABORATE DECISION GIVEN

By the Judge, Which is Reproduced in Full in This Morning's Intelligence. The Next Steps in the Liquor License Fight will be Taken this Morning—The Liquor Men will Continue the Fight to Higher Courts.

Yesterday, in the criminal court of Ohio county, Judge Hugus on the bench,

abatement cases, in which James Arthur and sixty-six other saloonists of Wheeling are in opposition to the legal-
ity of the indictments brought in by the September criminal court grand jury to the number of several hundred, most of them for selling whiskey on

the "short" license. It will be remembered the pleas in abatement were made with a demurrer on the part of the state, and Judge Hugus' decision given yesterday is the sustaining of the demurrer. In the opinion handed down by the judge, not so much stress is laid

On the irregularities attending the drawing of the September grand jury as there is upon the fact that the jury in attendance were not given in and important in their allegations.

This morning the matter will come up again on Mr. Howard's motion to quash the indictments and Prosecutors reply to the motion that the defendant pay the costs incurred up to the present time.

The interest in good authority that the interest in the state of the county and the state of the county and the state of the county.

United States, if necessary. Attorney Smith, who has been associated with Mr. Howard, was authority for this statement.

The opinion of Judge Hugus in full is as follows:

In these cases the defendants tendered to each indictment fifteen pleas in abatement. The state objected to their filing and on its objection

The pleas set up a great number of irregularities in selecting and impaneling the grand jury that indicted the defendants.

ing to the pleas assume the position that as these are dilatory pleas aiming to avoid the indictments to which they were pleaded by setting up technical matters solely, they should be judged by the strict technical rules applicable to the draughting of such pleas; and that if these pleas are open to a technical objection, they are so.

This position and these demurrers

then impose upon the court the obligation of inquiring into the rules governing at common law the construction of pleas in abatement, and to decide whether or not the matters attempted to be set up in abatement of the indictment are proper.

ments are pleaded according to the strict requirements of these rules. Chilly (1 Chilly pleadings 458 13 Am. ed., and the same 473 16 Am. ed.) says: "As pleas in abatement do not deny and yet tend to delay the trial of the

merits of the action great accuracy and precision are required in forming them. They should be certain to every intent, and certainty to every intent (2d 234) is that which precludes all argument, inference or presumption against the

Whorton (Crim. pleadings and prac. sec. 427) says: A plea in abatement is a dilatory plea and must be pleaded

with strict exactness. It should precisely set forth the facts out of which the defense arises, or a negative of the facts presumed from the record.

Bishop (1 Crim. prac. § 745) says: Pleadings in abatement require the highest

degree of certainty. When, therefore, a party answers a charge by matter not going to its merits and precluding inquiry into it, he should make the allegation in the extreme degree certain, that is in every particular. For it is just

that he who would ward off investigation by a technicality should be required himself to stand very technically erect. (2d sec. 324).

Bishop further says (2d sec. 327): In place of abatement it is necessary to

employ the extreme certainty and quotes with approval, Gould on pleadings sec. 57, where that author says: 'Certainty to a certain intent in every particular requires the utmost fullness and particularity of statement, as well as

the highest attainable accuracy and precision, leaving on the one hand nothing to be supplied by intendment or construction and on the other no supposable special answer unobviated.

books are fully sustained in the adjudications and cases decided.

People vs. Findlay, 1 Mich. 234; Belden vs. Laing, 8 Mich. 503; Heyman vs. Covell, 36 Mich. 159; People vs. Lander, 82 Mich. 189, 114; Burnham vs. How-

ard, 31 Me., 572; Perry vs. R. R., 71 Me., 360; Severy vs. Nye, 58 Me., 251; St vs. Heselton, 67 Me., 699; Posky vs. West, 16 Miss., 717; Ellis vs. Ellis, 4 R. I., 115; St vs. Duggan, 15 R. I., 415; Fowler vs. Arnold, 25 Ill., 284; Nixon vs. Ins. Co.

47 Ill., 444; *Feasler vs. Schriever*, 63 Ill., 322; *Haywood vs. Chestney*, 13 Wend., 495; *State vs. Emery*, 59 Vt., 84; *State vs. Ward*, 60 Vt., 162; *Mundum vs. Joy*, 58 N. H., 141 and 312; *Leons vs. Raffers*, 20 Minn., 527; *State vs. Ward*, 64

Mich., 549; State vs. Ward, 63 Mich., 226 and 226; State vs. Reeves, 10 So. R., 903 and 903; State vs. Lawrence, 986 A. A., 573; Horton vs. Towers, 6 Leigh, 57 and 58 (Hon. Judge Tucker says the utmost strictness in these pleas in

abatement); *Hovey vs. Insurance Company*, 37 W. Va., 250; *Woodell vs. West Virginia Improvement Company*, 28 W. Va., 39; *Quarrier vs. Insurance Co.*, 10 W. Va., 521; *State vs. Baker*, 33 W. Va., 324.

It is a sufficient answer to this complaint to say that our laws do not mention such a thing as a list of grand jurors that as no provision for selecting a list of grand jurors by any court, board or officer, much less providing for draw-